

THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the drawings currently on file with the clean substitute formal drawing sheets submitted herewith in the accompanying Submission of Formal Drawings.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1, 4 and 8 are the only independent claims.

A substitute set of replacement formal drawings is submitted herewith to replace the drawings originally filed. A Submission of Formal Drawings is being filed herewith. The substitute formal drawings are simply clean copies of those originally filed, and no new matter is being added.

The specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly not being written in “full, clear and exact terms.” Applicant traverses.

The Office Action, at page 2, gave examples of unclear, inexact and verbose terms by making reference to paragraphs [0006] and [0009] of the published application (US2002/0054624). However, the problems pointed out at page 2 of the Action are not problems that appear in the specification as filed. They are problems that occurred during scanning of the application by the Patent and Trademark Office. An examination of the originally-filed specification at the corresponding paragraphs on pages 2 and 3, shows that the alleged typographical errors do not exist in the specification as filed. As such they cannot be, and need not be, corrected by amendment. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The acknowledgment of the filing of the certified copy of the priority document in this application was incomplete on the Office Action Summary. Although the boxes for item 12 and sub-item (a) were checked, the further sub-item 12(a)(1) should also have been checked to make clear that the certified copy of the priority document had indeed been received. Applicant requests that all of the appropriate boxes be checked in the next Office Action.

Applicant has yet to receive an initialed copy of the PTO/SB/08B filed with the Information Disclosure Statement dated October 30, 2003. For the convenience of the Examiner, a duplicate copy of that paper is submitted herewith. Applicant requests that the paper be initialed and returned with the next Office Action.

Claims 1, 4 and 8 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over co-pending application 09/956,697 in view of Critchlow. Applicant hereby submits a Terminal Disclaimer making reference to application 09/956,697. The filing of the Terminal Disclaimer obviates the double patenting rejection.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: April 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586

DACKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant